

Quark confinement, topological susceptibility and all that in 4 dimensional gluodynamics.

A.R.Zhitnitsky ¹

CERN , Geneva, Switzerland

and

Institute of Nuclear Physics, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 630090 Novosibirsk, USSR.

Abstract

We discuss a few tightly connected problems, such as the $U(1)$ problem, confinement, the θ -dependence within a framework of the dynamical toron approach. We calculate two fundamental characteristics of the theory: the vacuum expectation value (vev) of the Wilson loop and the topological susceptibility. The analogy with well known 2+1 dimensional QED which exhibits confinement phenomenon is also discussed.

CERN-TH.6564/92

July 1992

¹e-mail address is zhitnita@vxcern.cern.ch

1.Introduction.

It is generally believed that the most profound features of the QCD- confinement and nontrivial θ dependence , the chiral symmetry breaking and the absence of the ninth Goldstone boson are tightly connected. Let me briefly sketch these old arguments.

We use the standard notations and the θ vacuum is introduced to the theory in the following way:

$$\Delta L = \theta Q \quad (1)$$

where Q is the topological charge which can be written for the 4d gluodynamics as follows:

$$Q = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int d^4x G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int d^4x \partial_\mu K_\mu, \quad a = 1, 2, 3. \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (2)$$

Here $G_{\mu\nu}^a$ is the field strength tensor. It is known , the θ term preserves renormalizability of the theory but is P and T odd. As it can be seen from (2) the θ term is a full divergence and therefore it is equivalent to certain boundary conditions . However as is known, the θ is the physical parameter of the theory and the θ - dependence of physics is linked to the $U(1)$ problem. [1],[2] . Indeed, if we believe that the resolution of the $U(1)$ problem appears within the framework of these papers ,we must assume that the correlator

$$K = i \int d^4x \langle 0 | T \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a(x), \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a(0) | 0 \rangle \quad (3)$$

is nonzero in pure Yang Mills theory (YM). It means that the vacuum expectation value (vev) of the topological density

$$\langle \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a \rangle = \frac{1}{2} K \theta, \quad \theta \ll 1. \quad (4)$$

is also nonzero . Therefore, the θ is observable parameter. The nonzero vev $\langle G\tilde{G} \rangle \neq 0$ does imply the CP -violation in physical transition and leads , for example ,to the mixing of the heavy quarkonium levels with $J^P = 0^+$ and $J^P = 0^-$. Only dispersion relations are used to translate $\langle G\tilde{G} \rangle \neq 0$ into a proof of CP- violation in physical effects. [3].

So, if we believe that $U(1)$ problem is solved in the framework of Witten-Veneziano approach [1],[2] we automatically get $K \neq 0$ (3) and therefore, the nontrivial θ dependence. With introduction of the light quarks (u,d,s) the value of correlator $K(3)$ changes ²,but θ parameter is still an experimentally observed quantity.

The next link comes from the analysis of the Ward Identities (WI) which imply [4] that the $U(1)$ problem is linked to the chiral symmetry breaking phenomenon. Indeed, the relevant WI (in QCD with N_f flavors) takes the form:

$$K_{QCD} = \frac{m}{N_f} \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle - \frac{m^2}{N_f^2} \int dx \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi(x), \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi(0) \quad (5)$$

and if we have the dynamical solution of the $U(1)$ problem (by other words,we are in position to calculate the singlet correlator in (5) to show its smallness in the chiral limit) we

²It is obviously that $K \sim m_q^1$ irrespectively to the number of light flavors [2].

should explain the relation between $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ condensate ,responsible for the chiral symmetry breaking and topological susceptibility , responsible for the solution $U(1)$ problem.

Besides that , in a similar way one can check that nontrivial θ dependence in pure YM theory is through θ/N at large N (in particular, $\langle \tilde{G}G \rangle \sim \sin(\frac{\theta}{N})$) [2]. Such a function can be periodic in θ with period 2π only if there are many vacuum states for given values of θ . These vacua should not be degenerated due to the vacua transitions , however the trace of the enlargement number of the vacuum states have to be seen in the course of a dynamical solution of the $U(1)$ problem. Therefore , we have a link between the $U(1)$ problem and an *additional (discrete) classification* of the vacuum states in the theory apart from the standard θ classification.

Another link , between $U(1)$ problem and confinement phenomenon , can be understood from the analysis of the effective lagrangian describing the low-energy spectrum and dynamics of the pseudoscalar nonet in the large N limit [5],[6]. The most important assumption which has been made in the derivation of the corresponding effective lagrangian was *confinement*. As it is known the obtaining lagrangian perfectly describes all properties mentioned above . In particular this lagrangian reproduces the correct θ/N dependence in YM theory.

Indeed, gluodynamics can be understood as a QCD with very large quark's mass. In this limit effective lagrangian was founded in [5] and it turns out that the number of vacua is of order N at $N \rightarrow \infty$. This fact actually is coded in the effective lagrangian containing the multi-branched logarithm $\log \det(U)$. In the Veneziano approach [2] the same fact can be seen from the formula for multiple derivation of the topological density Q with respect to θ at $\theta = 0$.

$$\frac{\partial^{2n-1}}{\partial \theta^{2n-1}} \langle Q(x) \rangle \sim \left(\frac{1}{N}\right)^{2n-1} , n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (6)$$

Therefore, the main idea of this sketch is as follows. All problems under consideration are tightly connected. Thus , any selfconsistent dynamical solution of one of them should be necessarily accompanied by the resolution of the rest problems within same approach.

The purpose of this letter is to demonstrate that such links indeed take place within framework of the dynamical toron ³ approach which was discussed early in context of different field theories, see ref.[7] and references therein. I would like to recall that in all known cases, the toron calculations give, at least, the selfconsistent results. Thus, one may expect that the analogous situation should takes place in the theory under consideration, i.e. in 4 dimensional gluodynamics with $SU(2)$ gauge group.

We discuss the statistical ensemble of quasiparticles which, presumably [8], describes the grand partition function of the 4d YM theory and which possesses strong quasiparticle interaction. It was shown that this ensemble describes the system with nontrivial

³ We keep the term "toron", introduced in ref.[9]. By this means we emphasize the fact that the considering solution minimizes the action and carries the topological charge $Q = 1/2$, i.e. it possesses all the characteristics ascribed to the standard toron [9]. However I should note from the very beginning of this paper, that our solution has nothing to do with the standard toron and it is formulated in principle in another way than in ref.[9]. The keeping of this term has a historical origin.

θ - dependence irrespectively to the strength of quasiparticle interaction . It should be noted,that the coexistence of the strong quasiparticle interaction and the nontrivial θ dependence is the nice feature of YM theory . 3d QED also possesses the long range quasiparticle interaction and confinement phenomenon [10]. In this simple model physics becomes θ independent just because of the strong quasiparticle interaction [11]. Crucial point is a very nontrivial algebraic structure of the quasiparticle interaction in YM theory, in comparision with analogous calculation of ref.[11] in Polyakov's model.

We will discuss the main assumptions which have been made in the description [8] of this statistical ensemble a bit later.Now I would like to cite the result of calculation of the topological density as a simplest application of the formulae obtained in ref. [8]:

$$\langle \tilde{G}G \rangle = i2\Lambda^4 \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}), \quad -\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi, \quad (7)$$

where the Λ is some renormalization invariant calculable combination ⁴

The nonzero value for topological density and its θ dependence are in agreement with main assumption of Witten-Veneziano approach [1],[2]. Indeed, the formula (7) implies that the topological susceptibility which is nothing but derivative of the topological density with respect to θ , is nonzero. Besides that, this formula is in agreement with Veneziano expression (6) for the multiple deriviation with respect to θ .

As it was argued above, the dynamical calculation of the topological density should be accompanied by the resolution of the rest problems. One such link was established already in the previous papers [8], [12]. Namely,it was demonstrated that the calculation of $\langle \tilde{G}G \rangle$ is accompanied by appearing of the additional quantum number (apart from the standard parameter θ) classifying a vacuum states.

In this letter we will consider the less trivial applications of the formulae describing the grand partition function of YM theory , ref.[8]. Namely, we will calculate the vev of the Wilson loop to demonstrate the confinement in this theory. This is the main result of the work.

Besides that, we find the topological susceptibility by explicit calculation (and not by differentiating $\langle \tilde{G}G \rangle$ with respect to θ) in order to check the selfconsistency of the approach. In such calculation we are able to keep the nonleading term (as $k \rightarrow 0$) in the correlator for the susceptibility. It turns out ,that this term is of order (k^4) and not of order (k^2) as it could be expected naively. Such behavior for the correlator is the direct result of the strong quasiparticle interaction and might have a phenomenological consequences.For example, the proton "spin" problem can be reduced to the problem of calculation of the first moment of the topological susceptibility [13].

Before we proceed to the detail consideration of the Wilson loop and topological susceptibility let me briefly formulate the basic assumptions of the toron approach.

i) I allow the configurations with fractional topological charge (one half for $SU(2)$ group) in the definition of the functional integral. It means that a multivalued functions appear in the functional integral. However, the main physical requirement is - all gauge

⁴Formula (7) is written in Euclidean space because its calculation based on the self dual solution defined in this space. In contrary, the formulae (3,4) is in Minkowski space.

invariant values must be singlevalued . Thus , the different cuts accompany the multi-valued functions should be unobservable, i.e. the gauge invariant values coincide on the upper and on the lower edges of the cut.

The direct consequence of the such definition of the functional integral is the appearing of the new quantum number classifying a vacuum states. Indeed, as soon as we allowed one half topological charge, the number of the classical vacuum states is increased by the same factor two in comparison with a standard classification, counting only integer winding numbers $|n\rangle$.

Of course, vacuum transitions eliminate this degeneracy. However the trace of enlargement number of the classical vacuum states does not disappear. Vacuum states now classified by two numbers : $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ and $k = 0, 1$. Let me repeat that origin for this is our main assumption that fractional charge is admitted and therefore the number of classical vacuum states is multiplied by a factor two.

I have to note that the same situation takes place in the supersymmetric YM theory, but in this case the vacuum states are still degenerate after vacuum transitions. The number k in this case just numerates different vacua at the same θ . However, the gauge classification for the winding vacua is the same for both models (supersymmetric and nonsupersymmetric one) before vacuum transitions.

ii) The next main point of the toron approach may be formulated as follows. We hope that in the functional integral of the gluodynamics , when the bare charge tends to zero and when we are calculating some long range correlation function, only certain field configurations (the toron of all types) are important. In this case the hopeless problem of integration over all possible fields is reduced to the problem of summation over classical toron configurations. I have no proof that the system of solutions which have been taken into account is a complete system. But I would like to stress that a lot of problems (like the θ dependence , the $U(1)$ problem , the counting of the discrete number of vacuum states , the confinement , the nonzero value for the vacuum energy and so on...) can be described in a very simple manner from this uniform point of view.

Both these points are quite nontrivial ones. However , I would like to convince the reader in the consistency of these assumptions by considering a more simple models , where the answers are well known beforehand. By this reason let me recall in passing that all calculations, based on the toron solution [7] demonstrate its very nontrivial role in different field theories. Most glaringly these effects appear in supersymmetric variants of a theory. In particular, in the supersymmetric CP^{N-1} -theories, the torons (point defects) can ensure a nonvanishing value for the $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle \sim \exp(2i\pi k/N + i\theta/N)$ with right θ -dependence. Such behavior is in agreement with the value of the Witten index which equals N [14] and in agreement with the large N -expansion [15]. In analogous way, the chiral condensates can be obtained for 4d theories: supersymmetric YM (SYM), supersymmetric QCD (SQCD)(see also calculations [16],[17], based on the standard 't Hooft solution). In these cases a lot of various results are known from independent consideration (such as the dependence of condensates on parameters m, g ; the Konishi anomaly equation and so on...). [18]. Toron approach is in agreement with these general results. The same approach can be used for physically interesting theory of QCD with $N_f = N_c$. In this case an analogous

calculation of $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ does possible because of cancellation of nonzero modes, like in supersymmetric theories. For this theory the contribution of the toron configurations to the chiral condensate has been calculated and is equal to: $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = -\pi^2 \exp(5/12) 2^4 \Lambda^3$ [7]. As is well known in any consistent mechanism for chiral breaking a lot of problems, such as: the $U(1)$ -problem, the number of discrete vacuum states, the θ -puzzle, low energy theorems and so on, must be solved in an automatic way. We have checked that all these properties [7] are consistent with the toron calculation.

2. The calculation of the topological susceptibility.

Let me start by giving a few formulae from ref.[8]. The grand partition function is given by

$$Z = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda^{4(k_1+k_2)}}{(k_1)!(k_2)!} \sum_{I_{\alpha}, q_{\alpha}} \prod_{i=1}^{k_1+k_2} d^4 x_i \exp(-\epsilon_{int.}), \quad (8)$$

$$\epsilon_{int.} = -\frac{4}{3} \sum_{i>j} q_i I_i \ln(x_i - x_j)^2 q_j I_j + \frac{2}{3} \ln L^2 \left(\sum_i q_i I_i \right)^2, \quad \Lambda^{4-1/3} = c \frac{M_0^{4-1/3}}{g^2(M_0)} \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi^2}{g^2(M_0)}\right).$$

where two different kinds of torons classified by the weight I_i of fundamental representation of the $SU(2)$ group and q_i is the sign of the topological charge. Besides that, in formula (8) the value $g^2(M_0)$ is the bare coupling constant and M_0 is ultraviolet regularization, so that eq.(8) depends on the renormalization invariant combination Λ . As it can be seen from (8) the only configurations satisfying the neutrality condition

$$\sum_i q_i I_i = 0 \quad (9)$$

are essential in thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. In obtaining (8) we took into account that the classical contribution to Z from k torons is equal to

$$Z \sim \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi^2}{g^2} k\right). \quad (10)$$

Besides that the factor $d^4 x_i$ in eq.(8) is due to the 4 translation coordinates accompany an each toron ⁵ and combinatorial factor $k_1!k_2!$ is necessary for avoiding double counting for k_1 torons and k_2 antitorons; lastly, the average overall configurations q, I is an average over all isotopical directions and topological charge signs of torons. The constant c in the definition of Λ is the calculable constant

$$c = 2^5 \pi^2 \exp(-\alpha(1)/2) \quad (11)$$

where the coefficient $\alpha(1)$ is tabulated in ref.[19].

To compute some vacuum expectation values it is convenient to use the correspondence between the grand partition function for the gas (8) and field theory with Sine-Gordon

⁵ Let us recall that the one toron has exactly four zero modes in contrary with instanton possessing by eight zero modes.

interaction , as it was done by Polyakov in ref.[10] for 3d QED. Let us rewrite (8) in the form:

$$Z_\theta = \int D\vec{\phi} \exp(- \int d^4x L_{eff}), \quad \square \equiv \partial_\mu \partial_\mu, \quad (12)$$

$$L_{eff} = 1/2(\square \vec{\phi})^2 - \sum_{\vec{I}_\alpha} \Lambda^4 \exp(i8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_\alpha \vec{\phi} + i\theta/2) - \sum_{\vec{I}_\alpha} \Lambda^4 \exp(-i8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_\alpha \vec{\phi} - i\theta/2).$$

In this derivation it was used the fact that the logarithm function which appears in the formula for the interaction (8) is the Green function for the operator $\square\square$. After that we can use the method [10] to express the generating functional in terms of effective field theory (12).

In this effective field theory the sum over $\vec{I}_\alpha$ runs over the 2 weights of the fundamental representation of $SU(2)$ group. Note, that the first interaction term is related to torons and the second one to antitorons. Besides that, since we wish to discuss the θ dependence , we also include a term proportional to the topological charge density $\frac{\theta}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$ to the starting lagrangian and corresponding track from this to the effective lagrangian(12).

The most important result from ref.[8] is the nontrivial dependence on θ of the topological density and susceptibility. These quantities are relevant for the solution of the $U(1)$ problem :

$$\langle \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} \rangle \equiv iF(\theta) = i2\Lambda^4 \sin(\theta/2), \quad -\pi \leq \theta \leq \pi. \quad (13)$$

$$\int d^4x \exp(ikx) \langle \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}(x), \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}(0) \rangle_{k \rightarrow 0} \sim \frac{dF(\theta)}{d\theta} \sim \frac{1}{2} \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}). \quad (14)$$

As was discussed in ref.[12], the reason to have the nontrivial θ -dependence (13,14) as well as the strong quasiparticle interaction $\sim \ln(x_i - x_j)^2$ (8) in YM theory, is the presence of the nontrivial algebraic structure $\sim q_i \vec{\mu}_i q_j \vec{\mu}_j$ in the expression for ϵ_{int} (8). Just this fact was crucial in the analysis of the 2 dimensional CP^{N-1} model also [8]. Such structure for ϵ_{int} is in the striking contrast with 2+1 Polyakov's model [10], where the interaction energy proportional to the topological (magnetic) charges of quasiparticles only:

$$\epsilon_{int} \sim \frac{q_i q_j}{|x_i - x_j|}. \quad (15)$$

Just this difference leads to the existence of the nontrivial θ dependence in 4d YM theory (in spite of the fact of the strong quasiparticle interaction $\sim \ln(x_i - x_j)^2$) in contrary with Polyakov's model where physics does not depend on θ .

We proceed now to the direct calculation of the topological susceptibility(14).

From the eq.(12) it is easy to reproduce the formula (13) for the vev of the topological density. To this aim we differentiate the Z_θ with respect to θ and put $\vec{\phi} = 0$ in the vacuum state. To compute a correlation functions depending on x^2 we have to introduce 2 different fields $\chi_\alpha, \alpha = 1, 2$ in place of the $\vec{\phi}$:

$$\chi_\alpha \equiv \frac{8\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \vec{I}_\alpha \vec{\phi}. \quad (16)$$

These χ_α fields should be considered as independent in the course of calculation , because the constraint

$$\sum \chi_\alpha = 0(mod 2\pi) \quad (17)$$

should be set to zero only at the end of calculation. The reason for this is as follows. The constraint (17) is appeared as a manifestation of the neutrality condition (9) in the infinite volume limit of the functional description (12) for our ensemble (8). We should be very careful in taking such limit in the course of calculation of a different topological characteristics. It can be argued that this limit should be set at the last stage of calculation only (otherwise, we would get some senseless results). Thus , the constraints (17) as well as (9) will be fixed at the end of calculation.

With the above consideration taken into account , the topological susceptibility can be expressed in terms of the new variable χ_α :

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_t(k) \equiv & \int d^4x \exp(ikx) \langle \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}(x), \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}(0) \rangle = \\ & -\Lambda^8 \int d^4x \exp(ikx) \langle \sin \chi_1(x), \sin \chi_1(0) + \sin \chi_2(x), \sin \chi_2(0) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Thus, the problem of calculation of the topological susceptibility reduces to the problem of calculation of the following correlation function:

$$\langle M_\alpha^+(x_1), M_\alpha(x_2) \rangle, \quad M_\alpha(x) \equiv \exp(i\chi_\alpha). \quad (19)$$

where the operator M is so called disorder operator.

The importance of disorder variables in gauge theories has been emphasized by 't Hooft [20], who has argued that rather than instantons it is the field configurations with nontrivial Z_N topological charge that should be considered responsible for the long range confinement of quarks. Analogous disorder variables have been used in different fields of physics [21]. In the context under consideration this variable was introduced in 2+1 Polyakov's model in ref.[22] and in two dimensional CP^{N-1} model in ref.[8].

A set of operators is now defined as follows. M is an operator that acts on original A_μ^a fields by gauge transforming them by $U^{x_0}(x)$; this gauge transformation is singular at x_0 and has the property that as x encircles x_0 , U does not return to its original value (as it happens in the instanton case), but acquires a Z_N phase ($N = 2$ for $SU(2)$ group):

$$U^{x_0}(\phi = 2\pi) = \exp(-i2\pi/N) U^{x_0}(\phi = 0), \quad U = \exp(2iI\phi) \quad (20)$$

where ϕ is an angle variable in the $x - y$ plane and the point x_0 lies at the same plane. From its definition it must be clear that $M(x)$ absorbs one half topological unit, so we say that $M(x)$ is the annihilation operator for one point toron at x with weight I and $M^+(x)$ is the creation operator for one toron.⁶ It should be clear , that U depends on all

⁶ Let me note that the small size instanton ($\rho \rightarrow 0$) at x_0 is also can be created by the singular gauge transformation $U(x)$. However, in the instanton case U does return to its original value (in contrast with (20)) as x encircles x_0 in the xy plane.

x_μ variables, so that M is the annihilation operator for the point defect. However, at the $x - y$ plane, U depends only on angle variable ϕ . The singularity of $A_\mu = iU^+ \partial_\mu U$ must be smeared over an infinitesimal region around x as it was done for the separate toron solution⁷. We will not consider the regularization problem in this paper.

Now we would like to demonstrate that the definition of M as an operator of large gauge transformation in terms of original fields exactly leads to the expression (19) in terms of the effective field theory (12). To this aim, let us consider the ϵ_{int} in the formula (8) after the action of the gauge transformation (20) at point x_0 . Because this gauge transformation creates an additional toron at point x_0 with isospin I_0 in the system of the other torons placed at x_i with isospins I_i we will obtain an additional contribution to the ϵ_{int} . Namely, after action of the operator M we have an additional interaction term between created toron I_0 and torons I_i from the system

$$\Delta\epsilon_{int} \sim \sum_i I_0 I_i \ln(x_0 - x_i)^2. \quad (21)$$

It is easy to understand that this interaction after simply repeating the derivation of eq.(12), reduces to the following expression in the effective field theory:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M(x_0) \rangle &= \int D\vec{\phi} \exp(-\int d^4x L_{eff.}) \exp(i8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_0\vec{\phi}(x_0) + i\theta/2), \quad \square \equiv \partial_\mu \partial_\mu, \quad (22) \\ L_{eff} &= 1/2(\square\vec{\phi})^2 - \sum_{\vec{I}_\alpha = \pm\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda^4 \exp(i8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_\alpha\vec{\phi} + i\theta/2) - \sum_{\vec{I}_\alpha} \Lambda^4 \exp(-i8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_\alpha\vec{\phi} - i\theta/2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the operator M under consideration in the effective theory looks like that

$$M_\alpha(x) = \exp(i8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_\alpha\vec{\phi}(x) + i\theta/2) = \exp(i\chi_\alpha(x) + i\theta/2), \quad (23)$$

where we rewrite eq.(23) in terms of the χ fields (16).

I would like to emphasize, that the expression for the operator of the large gauge transformation in terms of the effective variables (23) has the same form like in another field theories, 2+1 dimensional QED [22] and 2 dimensional CP^{N-1} models [8]. As it was argued in the last reference, it is not an accidental coincidence, but this fact has a very general origin.

Now we are in position to calculate the correlation function

$$\int d^4x \exp(ik(x_1 - x_2)) \langle M(x_1), M^+(x_2) \rangle \quad (24)$$

As it was explained in refs.[10], [22] in the analogous calculations in 3 dimensional QED we can not neglect terms related to insertions of $M(x)$. Rather, this functional integral can be estimated by the steepest descent method. Thus, if we assume that this functional integral is dominated by the classical field, χ satisfies

$$\square\square\chi + 2\Lambda^4\left(\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)^2 \sin\chi = i\left(\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)^2 (\delta^4(x - x_1) - \delta^4(x - x_2)). \quad (25)$$

⁷ Usually we have in mind the special kind of regularization which preserves the self-duality equation, so that the classical action for this configuration equals $\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2 N}$.

The physics suggests linearization is legitimate so we can substitute χ instead of $\sin(\chi)$ in the equation (25) and find $\chi_{cl}(x)$ by means of Fourier transformation. However, for our purpose an explicit form of $\chi_{cl}(x)$ is not needed, because we are interesting in the Fourier transformed form of the correlator (24). Simple calculation gives the following expression for this correlation function at $k \rightarrow 0$:

$$\int d^4x \exp(ik(x_1 - x_2)) \langle M(x_1), M^+(x_2) \rangle \sim (k^4 \frac{3}{64\pi^2} + \Lambda^4)^{-1}. \quad (26)$$

Now several comments are in order. First, in comparison with the well known expression for topological susceptibility at $k = 0$ (14) we were able to find the k dependence at small k . It turns out that the k dependence comes in this formula through k^4 . Such behavior, from the one hand, is the direct consequence of the strong logarithmic interaction of the pseudoparticles (8) and from the other hand it implies that

$$\chi'_t(k=0) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial k^2} \int d^4x \exp(ikx) \langle \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}(x), \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}(0) \rangle_{k=0} \rightarrow 0. \quad (27)$$

If such behavior were in QCD theory, this would mean the zero magnitude for the singlet axial form factor, $G_A(0)$ [13] in agreement with EMC experiment. However, this is not the case, because we have dealt with the pure YM theory without quarks and one could expect that the dynamical light quarks will change this situation. But we may expect that such k^4 behavior can not disappear without leaving a trace in the full theory. However, we can only speculate on this topic now.

As a second remark, we note that the link between the θ dependence in the theory, discrete number of vacuum states there and confinement phenomenon mentioned in Introduction can be understood by the following way.

From the one hand, we have nonzero value for the vev of the disorder operator M (23)

$$\langle M \rangle \sim \exp(2i\pi k/N + i\theta/N), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1. \quad (28)$$

In obtaining eq.(28) we took into account that in different vacua the fields χ_α take N different vacuum values $\chi_\alpha = 2\pi k/N$, as was discussed in ref.[8]⁸. On the classical level we have Z_N degeneracy, but on the quantum level, taking into account the toron vacuum transitions, these vacua have different energy as was the case in the standard $|\theta\rangle = \sum \exp(in\theta) |n\rangle$ vacuum consideration, but now there is only a finite number of vacua. The operator M plays the role analogous to the chiral condensate in QCD. Different worlds discussed above are labeled by the phase of this disorder parameter M .

From the other hand, one could expect that $\langle M \rangle \neq 0$ just corresponds to confinement phase. I have no rigorous proof for this, however, an analogous considerations in 2 dimensional $CP(N-1)$ model [8] and in 3 dimensional Polyakov's model [22], where vev of the disorder operator have been calculated, verify this conjecture. Moreover, the

⁸It is easy to understand that this is the direct consequence of the periodicity of the effective lagrangian (12). Although each of the separate solutions has a θ period of $2\pi N$, the overall minimum has a period 2π because of jumping from one value to another at $\theta = \pi$.

explicit calculation of the vev of the Wilson line in 4 dimensional gluodynamics (see the next section), also demonstrates the nontrivial relation between nonzero value for $\langle M \rangle$ and area law for Wilson loop $\langle W \rangle$.

As a last remark, I would like to note, that the correlator (18), describing a gluonium states, can be expressed in terms of the operator M . The corresponding correlation function in the x space

$$\langle M(x_1), M^+(x_2) \rangle_{(x_1-x_2) \rightarrow \infty} - \langle M \rangle^2 \sim \exp -|x_1 - x_2| \quad (29)$$

shows an exponential fall off at large distances. Thus, one could expect that the operator M can be identified with the creation operator of the lowest gluonium state. It is interesting to note that a solitonic operator in the different field theories as well as the vertex operator in the conformal field theories have the same exponential form. Thus, the creation operator M which should be highly nonlocal and nontrivial in terms of the original fields (A_μ^a -gluons) has a very simple form in the terms of the auxiliary (dual) variables χ_α .

3. Wilson loop operator

In order to show directly (without references to the analogy with 2 and 3 dimensional systems) that there are electric strings in the ensemble of our pseudoparticles (8) let us calculate the vev of the Wilson loop. As was explained above, the torons at large distances look like singular pure gauge field with definite isotopical direction and so, the A_μ^a field is abelian at large distances (in a more detail see [8]). Thus, the standard quasiclassical approximation, when we substitute for A_μ^a the corresponding classical solution, leads (after simply repeating the derivation of (12)) to the following expression for $\langle W \rangle$ at $\theta = 0$

$$\langle W \rangle = \langle Tr \exp(\oint_l i q A_\mu dx_\mu) \rangle = \quad (30)$$

$$\int D\vec{\phi} \exp(- \int d^4x L_{eff}), \quad L_{eff} = 1/2(\square\vec{\phi})^2 - \sum_{\vec{I}_\alpha} 2\Lambda^4 \cos(8\pi/\sqrt{3}\vec{I}_\alpha\vec{\phi} + \vec{I}_\alpha\vec{\Phi}).$$

where term proportional to Φ is related to Wilson loop insertion and has the following property : $\Phi(x)$ is equal to the external charge $2\pi q$ if $x \in S$, Wilson plane, and $\Phi = 0$ otherwise. In this derivation we took into account that if the toron is in the S plane, then the integral over $G_{\mu\nu} d\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ is non-zero, and it is equal to zero otherwise (see for a more detail about toron properties the ref .[8]).

Since the field $\Phi(x)$ is strong enough , we can not neglect non-linearities in (30) just like in the calculation of the topological susceptibility (see previous section). The estimation of this functional integral can be done as before by the steepest descent method with respect to ϕ . The corresponding field ϕ_{cl} is determined from the classical field equation,

$$\square \chi' + 2\Lambda^4 \left(\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\right)^2 \sin(\chi') = 2\pi\theta_S(z, t)\delta'(x)\delta'(y), \quad (31)$$

where $\chi' \equiv \chi + \vec{\Phi}\vec{I}$, $\delta'(x) \equiv \frac{d\delta(x)}{dx}$, $\theta_S(z, t) = 1$ if $z, t \in S$ and $\theta_S(z, t) = 0$ otherwise. The right- hand side of this equation is related to the Wilson loop insertion, i.e. with function

$\Phi(x)$. Indeed, for the Wilson loop placed in the $t - z$ plane we have $\Phi \sim \delta_{x,0}\delta_{y,0}$ and thus, acting by the operator $\square\square$ on Φ we exactly reproduce the right hand side of the eq.(31) (without loss of generality we consider $x > 0, y > 0$):

$$\square\square\delta_{x,0}\delta_{y,0} \sim \square\square(1 - \epsilon(x))(1 - \epsilon(y)) \sim \square[\delta'(x)(1 - \epsilon(y)) + \delta'(y)(1 - \epsilon(x))], \quad (32)$$

$$\square \equiv \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}, \quad x > 0, y > 0.$$

where we have substituted the expression $1 - \epsilon(x)$ in place of $\delta_{x,0}$ and used the following feature of the $\epsilon(x)$ function : $\square\epsilon(x) \sim \delta'(x)$. The next step of calculation of the r.h.s.(32) is the using of the Fourier representation for the functions $\epsilon(x) \sim \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin kx}{k} dk$ and $\delta(x) \sim \int_{-\infty}^\infty \exp(ikx) dk$ which leads to the desired result:

$$\begin{aligned} r.h.s.(32) &\sim \square \int dk_x k_x [1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \int dk_y \frac{\sin(k_y y)}{k_y}] \exp(ik_x x) + (x \rightarrow y) \\ &\sim \int_{-\infty}^\infty dk_x k_x \exp(ik_x x) \int_0^\infty dk_y k_y \sin(k_y y) + (x \rightarrow y) \sim \delta'(x)\delta'(y). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Now we are ready to estimate the functional integral (30) by the steepest descent method. For this purpose, we substitute χ instead of $\sin \chi$ in the eq.(31) and find χ_{cl} by means of Fourier transformation just as it was done before in the previous section for the calculation of the topological susceptibility. We expect that the accuracy for such procedure is not very high and the numerical coefficient given bellow should be considered as an estimation of the order of value. With these remarks in mind we obtain

$$\langle W \rangle \sim \exp(-\frac{\sqrt{3}\pi}{64\pi}\Lambda^2 S) \quad (34)$$

The result (34) implies that between two fixed charges there exists an electric string with energy density $\sim \Lambda^2$.

Now several comments are in order. First of all, I have to stress that the unusual kinetic term $(\square\chi)^2$ in the effective action (12) plays a crucial role in this derivation. From the one hand, such kinetic term is the direct consequence of the strong pseudoparticle interaction (8), and from the other hand, just this term gives a correct expression $\sim \delta'(x)\delta'(y)$ for the right hand side of eq.(31), leading to the existence of the solitonic shape solution in the x, y directions.⁹ This solitonic shape guarantee the convergence of the corresponding integral $\int dx dy$ over x, y directions, perpendicular to Wilson plane z, t and leads to confinement formula (34). The thickness of the sheet with Wilson loop as boundary is of order Λ^{-1} , plasma screening length, and not $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, toron size. This is just the reason to get the finite answer for the string tension (34) in comparison with our very rough previous

⁹ Let us note that the analogous problem in 3 dimensional QED looks as follow. If Wilson loop is placed in the xy plane, the equation, analogous to (31) is essentially one dimensional [10] and (χ_{cl}) depends only on z . The solitonic shape for the corresponding solution is due to the non-linearity ($\sim \delta'(z)$) related to the Wilson loop insertion. This solitonic shape guarantee the convergence of the corresponding integral $\int dz$, over perpendicular to Wilson loop direction and leads to the confinement formula.

estimation [8], where back reaction of the Wilson loop insertion has not been taken into account.

As a second remark, we note that our explicit calculation of the $\langle W \rangle \sim \exp(-S)$ is in the consistency with our conjecture that the confinement phase just corresponds to the nonzero value of disorder operator $\langle M \rangle$ (28). As it was mentioned above, it is also correct in the 2 dimensional CP^{N-1} model [8] and 3 dimensional QED [22] where an explicit calculations do possible.

4. Final remarks.

The main point of this Letter is that the *dynamical* solution of the one from the following problems: $U(1)$ problem, confinement problem, multiplicity of the vacuum states N , θ/N dependence, should be necessarily accompanied by the resolution of the rest problems within the same approach. We have checked this conjecture in the framework of the dynamical toron calculation. I expect that two main assumptions of this approach I am using

- i) the multivalued functions are admissible in the definition of the functional integral;
- ii) the only certain field configurations (torons) are important and the problem of integration over all possible fields is reduced to the problem of summation over classical toron configurations, are consistent assumptions. I have no proof for this, but I would like to stress that all problems mentioned above can be considered from this uniform point of view.

The main quantitative results, which have been obtained can be formulated as follow:

$$\chi_t(k \rightarrow 0) \sim (\frac{3k^4}{64\pi^2} + \Lambda^4)^{-1} \quad (35)$$

$$\langle M \rangle \sim \exp(i\theta/2 + i\pi k), k = 0, 1. \quad (36)$$

$$\langle W \rangle \sim \exp(-\sigma S) \quad (37)$$

The first eq.(35) shows that the k dependence of the topological susceptibility comes through k^4 . Such behavior might be important for explanation of EMC experiment.

The second eq.(36) explicitly demonstrates that vacua in YM theory are classified by the phase of the disorder operator M . Apart from standard parameter θ , $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$, there is a new label $k = 0, 1$. Although each of the separate solutions has a θ period 4π , the overall solution has a θ period of 2π because of the jumping from the one value ($k = 0$) to another ($k = 1$) at $\theta = \pi$. Such behavior is in agreement with large N results, where the number of vacuum states is equal N and θ dependence appears in the form θ/N . Besides that, $\langle M \rangle \neq 0$ is in consistency with the confinement property of the theory.

The explicit calculation of the vev of the Wilson line (37) also confirms this conjecture.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to G. Veneziano for stimulating discussions, H. Leutwyler and A. Smilga for organization of Moscow - Bern seminar, where this work was presented and also to the CERN Theory Division where this work was done.

References

- [1] E.Witten, Nucl.Phys.**B156**,269 (1979).
- [2] G.Veneziano, Nucl.Phys.**B159**,213 (1979).
- [3] M.Shifman , A.Vainshtein and V.Zakharov , Nucl Phys.**B166** ,493(1980).
- [4] R.Crewther . Phys.Lett. **B70**,349 (1977);**B93**,75(1980).
- [5] E.Witten,Ann.Phys.(N.Y.)128,(1980),363.
- [6] P.Di Vecchia and G. Veneziano, Nucl.Phys. **B171**,253(1980).
- [7] A.R.Zhitnitsky, Nucl.Phys.**B340**,56 (1990).
- [8] A.R.Zhitnitsky, Nucl.Phys.**B374**,183(1992).
- [9] G't Hooft, Commun.Math.Phys.81(1981)267.
- [10] A. Polyakov, Nucl.Phys.**B120**,428 (1977).
- [11] S.Vergeles, Nucl.Phys.**B152**,330 (1979).
- [12] A.Zhitnitsky, Preprint IASSNS 91-76, November 1991,be published in Phys.Lett.B
- [13] G.Veneziano, Mod.Phys.Lett.**A4**,1605 (1989)
G.M.Shore and G.Veneziano, Phys.Lett.**B 244**,75 (1990),
Preprint CERN-TH.6019/91
- [14] E.Witten, Nucl.Phys.**B202**,253 (1982).
- [15] A.D'Adda,P.Di Vecchia and M.Luscher, Nucl.Phys.**B14**,63 (1978).
E.Cremer and J.Scherk, Phys.Lett.**B74**,341 (1978).
H.Eichenherr, Nucl.Phys.**B146**,215 (1978).
E.Witten, Nucl.Phys.**B149**,285 (1979).
- [16] E. Cohen and C. Gomez, Phys.Rev.Lett.52(1984)237
- [17] C. Gomez, Phys.Lett.B 141 (1984),366.
- [18] D.Amati et al., Phys.Rep.**162**,169(1988).
- [19] G 't Hooft, Phys.Rev.**D14**,3432 (1976).
- [20] G 't Hooft, Nucl.Phys.**B138**,1(1978).

- [21] L.P.Kadanoff and H.Geva, Phys, Rev.**B3**,3918(1971).
E.Fradkin and L.P.kadanoff, Nucl.Phys.**B170**,1(1980).
V.Fateev and A.B.Zamolodchikov, Sov.Phys.JETP **82**,215 (1985).
- [22] N.J.Snyderman , Nucl.Phys.**B 218**,381 (1983).